



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/767,085	01/29/2004	Gus Rashid	3520-220US	1714
Richard C. Woodbridge, Esq. Synnestvedt Lechner & Woodbridge, LLP P.O. Box 592 Princeton, NJ 08542-0592			EXAMINER HOANG, HIEU T	
			ART UNIT 2152	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 07/09/2008	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/767,085

**Applicant(s)**

RASHID ET AL.

**Examiner**

HIEU T. HOANG

**Art Unit**

2152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 May 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This office action is in response to the communication filed on 05/19/2008.
2. Claims 1-20 are pending.

***Response to Amendment***

3. Previous objection of the specification has been withdrawn due to the amendment.
4. The objection of claims 11-20 has been withdrawn due to the amendment.

***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are moot in view of new ground(s) of rejection.

***Specification***

6. The specification is objected to for lacking of disclosure on operating "independently of...symbols" that is recited in claims 9, 10, 15 and 20 and "includable data type" as recited in claims 1, 11 and 16. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:  

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
8. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

Art Unit: 2152

applicant regards as the invention. The claims recite "includable data type." There is no support for this limitation in the specification. It is vague what is meant by an includable data type as to where the data type is included, whether it can be included or allowed to be included.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1-3, 6, 11, 12, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Juitt et al. (US 2003/0087629, hereafter Juitt), in view of Bonifati et al. (Pushing Reactive Services to XML Repositories using Active Rules, hereafter Bonifati), further in view of what has been known in the art (Official Notice or ON).

Art Unit: 2152

11. For claim 1, Juitt discloses a notification generation and transmittal method, comprising:

- associating a user with a client device; registering said association with a server ([0065] lines 1-6, device id and user identifier are both registered at the server for authentication);

Juitt does not disclose:

- generating, by a runtime component on said server, a notification for said user, said notification including a set of data selected from an application database by a process having encoded rules including a document-field related rule for an includable data type; and,
- transmitting said notification to said user via said client device;

However, Bonifati discloses:

- generating, by a runtime component on said server (page 6, action, par. 2, runtime generating of notifications), a notification for said user (page 2, par. 3, 4), said notification including a set of data selected from an application database (page 9 XML code part, fig. 1, action is a notification of satisfied rules, notifications generated in a service supplier or an E-service application database) by a process having encoded rules (page 4, XML code part; page 9 XML code part, page 5 Event, par. 3; XML schema is read as encoded rules involving *price* field and *car* field of an XML document); and,
- transmitting said notification to said user via said client device (fig. 1, rule generated messages sent to clients via client device).

Official notice is taken that XML schema rules involving includable data types for a document field is known in the art (see Hyman et al., US 6,446,256, col. 1 lines 31-41, schema including rules of which data type is suitable for which field)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Juitt and Bonifati and what has been known to authenticate the user using both device and user identifiers at a XML rule-based notification of Bonifati.

12. For claim 11, Juitt discloses a notification generation and transmittal apparatus, comprising:

- A client device, said client device being associated with a particular user; a server linked to said client device by a network connection, said server being operable for registering said association between said client device and said particular user ([0065] lines 1-6, device id and user identifier are both registered at the server for authentication);

Juitt does not disclose:

- A notification for said user generated on said server by a runtime component operable on said server, said notification including a set of document related data selected from an application database by a process having encoded rules including a document-field related rule for an includable data type; and,
- A further network connection operable to transmit said notification from said server to said user via said client device;

However, Bonifati discloses:

- A notification for said user generated on said server by a runtime component operable on said server (page 6, action, par. 2, runtime generating of notifications), said notification including a set of document related data selected from an application database (page 9 XML code part, fig. 1, action is a notification of satisfied rules, notifications generated in a service supplier or an E-service application database) by a process having encoded rules (page 4, XML code part; page 9 XML code part, page 5 Event, par. 3; XML schema is read as encoded rules involving *price* field and *car* field of an XML document); and,
- A further network connection operable to transmit said notification from said server to said user via said client device (fig. 1, rule generated messages sent to clients via client device).

Official notice is taken that XML schema rules involving includable data types for a document field is known in the art (see Hyman et al., US 6,446,256, col. 1 lines 31-41, schema including rules of which data type is suitable for which field)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Juitt and Bonifati and what has been known to authenticate the user using both device and user identifiers at a XML rule-based notification of Bonifati.

Art Unit: 2152

13. For claim 2, Juitt-Bonifati-ON discloses the invention as in claim 1. Juitt-Bonifati-ON further discloses said associating a user with a client device further includes authenticating said user (Juitt, [0065] lines 1-6).

14. For claims 3 and 12, Juitt-Bonifati-ON discloses the invention as in claims 1, 11. Juitt-Bonifati-ON further discloses said transmitting said notification further includes said client having a push-configured run-time-component capable of waiting for a notification (Bonifati, abstract, push notification to clients).

15. For claim 19, Juitt-Bonifati discloses the invention as in claim 16. Juitt-Bonifati does not disclose said process having encoded rules includes at least one data abstraction layer (DAL) object. However, Official notice is taken that DAL objects are known in XML schema rules (see e.g., Hickman et al. US 6,523,036, col. 21 lines 43-53, XML schema with DAL objects). It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Juitt, Bonifati and what has been known to provide rules for a data abstraction layer object to the notification scheme of Bonifati.

16. For claim 6, the claim is rejected for the same rationale as in claim 19.

17. Claims 16, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Juitt, in view of Bonifati.



18. For claim 16, Juitt discloses a notification generation and transmittal device, comprising:

- means for associating a user with a client device; means for registering said association with a server linked to said client device by a network connection ([0065] lines 1-6, device id and user identifier are both registered at the server for authentication);

Juitt does not disclose:

- means for generating, on said server, a notification for said user, said notification including a set of data selected from an application database by a process having encoded rules; and,
- means for transmitting said notification from said server via a further network connection to said user via said client device.

However, Bonifati discloses:

- means for generating, on said server, a notification for said user, said notification including a set of data selected from an application database (page 9 XML code part, fig. 1, action is a notification of satisfied rules, notifications generated in a service supplier or an E-service application database) by a process having encoded rules (page 4, XML code part; page 9 XML code part, page 5 Event, par. 3; XML schema is read as encoded rules involving *price* field and *car* field of an XML document); and,

Art Unit: 2152

- means for transmitting said notification from said server via a further network connection to said user via said client device (fig. 1, rule generated messages sent to clients via client device).

19. For claim 17, Juitt-Bonifati discloses the invention as in claim 16. Juitt-Bonifati further discloses said transmitting said notification further includes said client having a push-configured run-time-component capable of waiting for a notification (Bonifati, abstract, push notification to clients).

20. Claims 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Juitt, Bonifati, further in view of Allavarpu et al. (US 7,228,346, hereafter Allavarpu)

21. For claims 18 and 20, Juitt-Bonifati discloses the invention as in claim 16. Juitt-Bonifati does not disclose said transmitting said notification further includes said client having a poll-configured run-time-component capable of setting a timer; waiting for an expiration of said timer; and, querying said server for said notification on detecting said expiration.

However, Allavarpu discloses the same (col. 12 lines 4-6, polling or client requesting the server for notifications, periodical polling is known in the art).

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Juitt, Bonifati and Allavarpu to poll for notifications instead of pushing to provide an alternative to pushing.

22. For claim 20, Juitt-Bonifati-Allavarpu discloses the invention as in claim 16 and 18. Juitt-Bonifati-Allavarpu further discloses packaging said notification by one or more packaging rules incorporated into a server run-time-component (Bonifati, page 12, rule packaging) so that the data matches a form expected by a client run-time-component, thereby ensuring that one or more formatting rules incorporated into said client run-time-component, and operating independently of any data-related symbol-interpretation, can properly format said set of data for display on said client device (Allavarpu, col. 20, lines 27-67, client-selected format for notifications).

Art Unit: 2152

23. Claims 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Juitt, Bonifati, what has been known in the art, further in view of Allavarpu.

24. For claims 4, 13, Juitt-Bonifati-ON discloses the invention as in claims 1, 11. Juitt-Bonifati-ON does not disclose said transmitting said notification further includes said client having a poll-configured run-time-component capable of setting a timer; waiting for an expiration of said timer; and, querying said server for said notification on detecting said expiration.

However, Allavarpu discloses the same (Allavarpu, col. 12 lines 4-6, polling or client requesting the server for notifications, periodical polling is known in the art).

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Juitt, Bonifati, and what has been known and Allavarpu to poll for notifications instead of pushing to provide an alternative to pushing.

25. For claims 5 and 14, the claims are rejected as in claims 1 and 11. Juitt-Bonifati-ON does not disclose said encoded rules specify a type of notification and wherein said client device selects a notification handler to display said notification based on said type of notification specified

However, Allavarpu discloses the same (Allavarpu, col. 12 lines 12-19, client choosing format for notifications).

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Juitt, Bonifati, what has been known and Allavarpu to provide different formats for using notifications.

26. For claim 7, Juitt-Bonifati-ON-Allavarpu discloses the invention as in claim 5. Juitt-Bonifati-ON-Allavarpu further discloses said application database is updated following said transmitting of said notification (Allavarpu, fig. 4, step 414, manager application client receives and updates by notification from EDS sink).

27. For claims 9 and 15, Juitt-Bonifati-ON-Allavarpu discloses the invention as in claims 1 and 11. Juitt-Bonifati-ON-Allavarpu further discloses formatting said notification for display on said client device using one or more formatting rules incorporated into a run-time-component on said client device, said formatting rules operating independently of any interpretation of any symbols embedded in said set of data, thereby eliminating the need to transmit formatting information along with said set of data (Allavarpu, col. 20, lines 27-67, client-selected format for notifications)

28. For claim 10, the claim is rejected for the same rationale as in claim 20.

29. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Juitt-Bonifati-ON, further in view of Ericsson (SyncML Sync Protocol, version 1.0, hereafter Ericsson).

30. For claim 8, Juitt-Bonifati-ON discloses the invention as in claim 1. Juitt-Bonifati-ON further discloses said client device handles said data set contained in said notification by means of a client application (Bonifati, fig. 13, client manager application receiving notifications)

Juitt-Bonifati-ON does not explicitly disclose said notification contains a statement enabling said client application to interactively query said application database.

However, Ericsson discloses the same (fig. 10, fig. 7, sync Alert message to client followed by sync request from client to server)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Juitt-Bonifati-ON and Ericsson to request data from the server after notification that the data is available at the server to initiate any synchronization method as disclosed by Ericsson.

### ***Conclusion***

31. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

32. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hieu T. Hoang whose telephone number is 571-270-1253. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 8 a.m.-5 p.m., EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571-272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Art Unit: 2152

/Bunjod Jaroenchonwanit/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2152